

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Remarks

SEP 14 2006

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested, particularly as herein amended.

Before turning to the merits of the Office Action of June 27, 2006, the undersigned would like to acknowledge an interview which was conducted with the Examiner by telephone on August 24, 2006. During this interview, the rejection of independent claim 18 based on the cited patent to Padiak et al. was discussed, and the undersigned was provided with a further explanation of how Padiak et al. was being applied to independent claim 18. The undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of this interview, and for the clarification which was provided.

*Interview Record OK
-JMN
11/25/06*

Turning to the merits of the Office Action of June 27, 2006, claim 30 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for reciting a bracket "separated from" the associated fixture. In reply, this has been clarified by reciting a bracket which is "spaced from" the fixture, to overcome the stated rejection. Although not included in the rejection formulated under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, a similar amendment has been made to dependent claim 31, which included a similar recitation of structural elements.

Claims 1 to 5, 9 to 13 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,182,546 (Raymond). In reply, independent claim 1 has been